



**PATENT APPLICATION**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of

Docket No: Q78532

Hiroaki YASUDA

Appln. No.: 10/718,643

Group Art Unit: 2884

Confirmation No.: 1194

Examiner: Constantine HANNAHER

Filed: November 24, 2003

For: RADIATION IMAGE READ-OUT APARATUS AND RADIATION IMAGE  
CONVERTOR PANEL

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the interviews conducted on  
June 16, 2006 and July 27, 2006:

**REMARKS**

An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) summarizing the telephone  
interview initiated by Applicant's representative on June 16, 2006 and conducted on June 19,  
2006 by request of the Examiner was attached with the Office Communication dated June 22,  
2006.

During the interview, claims 1, 3 and 7 were discussed. No agreement with respect to the  
claims was reached.

Applicant's representative inquired as to whether a statement with regard to claim 7, that "the inclusion of a separate filter for the recited two purposes is not a requirement of claim 1" made by the Examiner on page 6 of the Final Office Action, dated March 16, 2006, raised the possibility of an amendment to claim 1 placing the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner maintained the position that the statement did not apply against a rejection of claim 1 in view of the fact that claim 7, which includes the separate filter limitation, had been rejected, and that further argument for patentability of claim 7 would require further search since the Examiner does not consider the use of two filters in place of one nonobvious.

In discussions with regard to claim 3, the Examiner disagreed that the recitation of endpoints for the range created any scope which would involve transmission at wavelengths beyond the range, in view of claim 1 which required attenuation in an open ended range. The Examiner maintained the position that the attenuation taught by Mitchell et al. (U.S. 2003/0042445) in a range which encompasses the recited range is considered to apply to claim 3.

An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) summarizing the telephone interview initiated by Applicant's representative on July 27, 2006 was attached with the Office Communication dated August 3, 2006.

During the interview, claims 7 and 8 were discussed. Applicant's representative proposed the use of a declaration of unexpected results regarding the use of separate filters to overcome the single filter shown in Mitchell et al. (U.S. 2003/0042445). The Examiner

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE INTERVIEW  
U.S. SERIAL NO.: 10/718,643

Atty. Docket No.: Q78532

indicated that this might be a reasonable approach, but that further search would be required which might change the closest prior art which the declaration would have to discuss.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

**It is believed that no petition or fee is required.** However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Susan P. Pan  
Registration No. 41,239

Date: August 16, 2006